

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:**

Entry of the above amendments, and reconsideration of the claim rejections, as they might apply to the original and amended claims in view of these remarks, is respectfully requested. Please add new claims 21-26 which find support throughout the written description. Specifically, support for new claims 21-23 may be found on page 7, lines 6-11 in the specification, and support for new claims 24-26 may be found on page 9, line 25 through page 10, line 7 in the specification. Claims 2-5, 9-11, and 15-18 have been previously cancelled. Claims 1, 6-8, 12-14, and 19-26 remain in the application. In this Response, no claims have been amended.

**A.     Objections to the Specification  
          For Informalities**

**Item 2 In The Office Action**

The Examiner objected to the disclosure because of the following informalities (Note: the Item numbering utilized above and following matches that used by the Examiner in the office action):

Page 9, line 9: The phrase “or the container” has been corrected to read “of the container” as suggested by the Examiner.

**B.     Rejection of Claims  
          Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

**(i).    Items 3 and 4 In The Office Action**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 6-8, 12-14, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kruempelmann et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,191,410 in view of Joseph, U.S. Patent No. 5,873,106.

Applicants respectfully traverse the §103(a) rejections because the Examiner has failed to state a prima facie case of obviousness. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), under the new examination guidelines for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of the Supreme Court decision in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*,

127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007), the Examiner must articulate at least one of seven rationales to reject claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 as follows:

(A) Combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results;

(B) Simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results;

(C) Use of known technique to improve similar devices, methods, or products, in the same way;

(D) Applying a known technique to a known device, method, or product, ready for improvement to yield predictable results;

(E) “Obvious to try”—choosing from a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, with a reasonable expectation of success;

(F) Known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art;

(G) Some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art that would have led one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention. (*See Examination Guidelines for Determining Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in View of the Supreme Court Decision in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 72 Fed. Reg., No. 195, Oct. 10, 2007 (p. 57529).

Further, under *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, there “must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007). Specifically, the cited reference fails to teach or suggest the elements discussed below.

Kruempelmann et al. is directed to managing the information display of various resources (*See col. 1, lines 22-24*). Messages are received indicating that information of a resource is to be displayed, and a user interface is formed for displaying the resource information by defining a pane in which to display the information and selecting a render operable to render the

information in the pane (*See* col. 1, lines 24-30). Kruempelmann et al. teaches an abstraction layer, but the abstraction layer is quite different from that claimed by applicant. The abstraction layer 144 of Kruempelmann et al. “is operable to extract, correlate, and/or understand the information and logic in enterprise infrastructure 150, which includes data 154 and applications 156. In accomplishing this, abstraction layer 144 may aggregate and classify the information. For example, abstraction layer 144 may use metadata to categorize documents into multiple taxonomies, for browsing and/or retrieval. In particular embodiments, [abstraction] layer 144 stores pointers to documents in a folder hierarchy, which ensures nonredundant storage and allows access control to be tied to the roles of users.” (*See* col. 3, lines 58-66). The abstraction layer claimed by Applicant in independent claims 1, 8, and 14, however, **knows nothing about the applications, or the resources, those applications represent.** The abstraction layer claimed by applicant **only receives from the application parameters associated with an editing request detected by the application.** Based upon those parameters, and the abstraction layer’s ability to read properties associated with a container, and properties of objects contained within the container that is currently displayed, the abstraction layer is able to **edit the object based upon the passed in parameters** and the abstraction layer’s **knowledge of the container and objects within the container.**

The Examiner cites to Joseph for teaching what the Kruempelmann et al. reference is lacking. However, Joseph adds nothing to the equation. Joseph is directed to geometry management of objects for generating forms through a form building program where the relationships between objects to be displayed on the form can be designed and laid out. (*See* col. 1, lines 37-40.) “At design or layout time, the child objects are placed in a parent container.” (*See* col. 1, lines 65-66.) “At an initial design time, a user enters user preferences and geometry constraints to define the relationships among the objects. In the preferred embodiment, the user executes a drag and drop operation and an alignment operation to create persistent geometry management constraints that are active at run time as well as design time.” (*See* col. 2, lines 12-17.)

Joseph does not teach an abstraction layer at all, let alone an abstraction layer operating between an application and manipulation of objects and containers to be displayed on a graphic display, wherein the abstraction layer **knows nothing about the applications, or the resources,**

**those applications represent.** Indeed, the geometry management system of Joseph is directly tied into the form building program. User input for design and layout of the form are received by the geometry management system directly from the user. In this sense, Joseph is just like Kruempelmann et al., but without an abstraction layer. The abstraction layer of Kruempelmann et al. and the geometry manager of Joseph both know directly about the application and the resources of that application where edit requests are generated. The abstraction layer claimed by Applicant can work with multiple different applications (see page 7, lines 8-11 in the specification) without knowing anything about the applications or the resources available to the application. Applicant fails to see how one skilled in the art would therefore be motivated to combine the teachings of Kruempelmann et al. and Joseph to arrive at Applicant's claimed invention. Combining these two references could not result in a system claimed by Applicant that has an abstraction layer that is ignorant of the application that is sending parameters for an edit request detected by the application.

For the forgoing reasons, neither Kruempelmann et al. nor Joseph individually or in combination, teach all the limitations of independent claims 1, 8, and 14 and therefore cannot render obvious the present invention as claimed. Independent claims 1, 8, and 14 are therefore allowable over the prior art of record and should be allowed. Claims 6, 7, 12, 13, and 19 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 8, or 14 and include all the elements and limitations thereof. Thus, dependent claims 6, 7, 12, 13, and 19 are also allowable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests retraction of the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 6-8, 12-14, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). For the same reasons, new claims 21-26 should also be allowed.

**CONCLUSION:**

This Amendment fully responds to the Final Office Action mailed on July 24, 2008. Still, that Office Action may contain arguments and rejections that are not directly addressed by this Amendment due to the fact that they are rendered moot in light of the preceding arguments in favor of patentability. Hence, failure of this Amendment to directly address an argument raised in the Office Action should not be taken as an indication that the Applicant believes the argument has merit. Furthermore, the claims of the present application may include other elements, not discussed in this Amendment, which are not shown, taught, or otherwise suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the preceding arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

Thus, a bona-fide attempt has been made to ensure that the application meets all statutory requirements and is in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early indication to that effect is, therefore, courteously solicited. If a telephone conference would expedite allowance or resolve any additional questions, such a call is invited at the Examiner's convenience.

Applicant does not believe that any fees are due with this response. If this is not the case, please charge all required fees, or fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17, or all required extension of time fees due, or credit any overpayment to, deposit account 13-2725. Please consider this a Petition For Extension Of Time for a sufficient number of months to enter this correspondence, or any future reply, if appropriate, for an extension of time for its timely submission.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(303) 357-1632



By: Stanley J. Gradisar  
Stanley J. Gradisar, Esq., Reg. No. 42,598  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: September 24, 2008